UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/540,523	01/03/2006	Shinji Hirai	052668	5341	
	7590 04/14/201 , HATTORI, DANIEL	EXAMINER			
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			BALL, JOHN C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/14/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/540,523	HIRAI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
J. CHRISTOPHER BALL	1795	

	J. CHRISTOPHER BALL	1/95	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 April 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount on the nortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	•	E below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	<b>-</b>		
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ov showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Nam X Nguyen/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1753			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant argues that KISHI does not teach an electrical conductor directly connecting the first and second electrode making the first and second electrode electrically short-circuited, as recited in claim 1. However, in the previous Final rejection, the Examiner specifically cited where in KISHI it is explicitly taught to have a electrically short-circuiting between a first electrode and second electrode (Col. 27, lines 10-17). The Applicants argue that "electrode 156-a and electrode 156-b connected to make a short-circuit are on the same substrate, i.e., on the same electrode", and they are not the first and/or second electrode. This argument is not persausive. The Examiner's position in the Final rejection, as now, is that the terms "first electrode" and "second electrode" are broad enough that they encompass the electrode 156-a and 156-b of KISHI as no functionality of the electrodes are set forth in the claim, and therefore that the rejection of the claim is proper. Applicant's arguments for patentability of the other claims are based on the premise that claim 1 is patentable, which is not persausive.